



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

a burden is pure modernism of the most gratuitous kind. That was not the way in which our Lord thought of the work that the Father had given him to do." This surely begs the question; it assumes that the work given was messianic. Joyfully Jesus did the assigned task, as Sanday contends. But is it proved that Jesus understood the task to be adequately subsumed as messianic?

As with previous works that have come in recent years from the hands of Professor Sanday, this survey is one of the forms of preparation for the larger task he has set himself, the complete treatment of the Life of Jesus. Only in a secondary degree is there an endeavor to state personal views. In the main, these are found in certain chapters that do not deal with the content of recent literature. Among these, that on Miracles is a model of historical method and reasonableness. Not until Professor Sanday has the opportunity for complete and defended statement will it be possible to determine his solution of the serious problems in the records of the Life of Jesus that have been so bravely faced and unflinchingly challenged by scholars who have been led to hold consistently to the eschatological theory. Meantime, it is of profound interest and significance to observe the concessions made to this school by so conservative and fair a scholar as Professor Sanday.

HENRY BURTON SHARMAN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

### SOME STUDIES IN THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

There is no preliminary work more important than the determination of the method of construction of our Synoptic Gospels. Every contribution to a solution of the many problems raised by the obvious relationships of these gospels must be warmly welcomed by all workers in the New Testament field. Under the title *Gospel Development*<sup>1</sup> another study is given to the phenomena presented in the gospel records. Mr. Ward is of the opinion that the beginning was made by Matthew's Logia. Subsequent to this time, or about the same time as the production of the Logia, came the first draft of Mark, afterwards systematically arranged and enlarged. Shortly following this revision of Mark, Matthew's Logia was taken in hand, translated into Greek, arranged in regular discourses, like the Sermon on the Mount, and the denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees, to which other discourses were added, compiled mostly from Mark, like the charge to the

<sup>1</sup> *Gospel Development. A Study of the Origin and Growth of the Four Gospels.* By Caleb Theophilus Ward. Brooklyn: Synoptic Publication Company, 1907. xiii + 404 pages. \$2.00.

twelve apostles, and the eschatological discourse, with a number of parables from an unknown source. Among these were interspersed various incidents, taken principally from Mark, the entire work constituting our Gospel of Matthew. Sometime during the first century John wrote a short gospel, which became the basis, in the hands of a follower of John, of our Gospel of John. Last of all, someone undertook to write a gospel for the Gentile Christians. It was based mainly on the existing gospels of Mark and Matthew, while also indebted to other records, as the Gospel of John, the Gospel of the Hebrews, and to various traditions current in his day. This was known from the first as the Gospel of Luke. The true chronological order of the present gospels is therefore John, Mark, Matthew, and Luke.

Though the author's discussions run into hundreds of pages, there is entirely wanting any broadly based and severely accurate method in his work. It is altogether too late in the history of the subject for anyone seriously to put forward the theory that Luke is dependent upon our Matthew, and has a different order in many of the sayings of Jesus because of his desire to magnify the final journey of Jesus to Jerusalem. It may be regarded as fully settled that Mark is the basis of Matthew and Luke, and that Luke and Matthew are not interdependent but mutually dependent upon some other documentary source or sources. What value there is in Mr. Ward's work lies in certain of the multitude of suggestions made by him in the course of his detailed treatment of the likenesses and differences of the gospels and their explanation. But these are unfortunately so buried in a mass of arbitrary and subjective judgments that they will not receive the serious attention they deserve.

HENRY BURTON SHARMAN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

Nicolardot's volume on the synoptic problem<sup>2</sup> is not primarily a study of the sources from which the evangelists drew their information, but of the editorial aims and methods pursued by them in putting together the material at their command. In devoting his entire volume to this particular phase of the synoptic problem, the author is conscious of making a departure in this important field of investigation. In the absence of such an independent treatment as is offered by him, he is of the opinion that the majority of exegetes have been able to bring to the solution of the synoptic problem only sporadic and fragmentary contributions. He does not claim to have discovered the need of such a work, but freely ascribes that honor to MM.

<sup>2</sup>*Les procédés de rédaction des trois premiers évangélistes.* Par Firmin Nicolardot. Paris: Fishbacher, 1908. Pp. xxi+315.

Maurice Vernes, and Loisy. He quotes the following from the latter; "Before formulating conclusions on the history of the gospel tradition one ought first to study the editorial processes of the evangelists," or, as Loisy elsewhere expresses it, "the measure of liberty which each editor has been able to take with his immediate source."

The vexed problem of the sources our author disposes of briefly in his Introduction, and bases his work upon the following hypotheses: (1) Mark is the oldest of the three Gospels; (2) Matthew and Luke have followed, in a very great number of cases, our canonical Mark; (3) the points at which Matthew and Luke have departed from our present Mark are not attributable to their having access to a form of Mark's Gospel older than ours, namely, a "proto-Mark," but to their utilization of the Sayings of Jesus, which, by most moderns, are denominated the "Logia," but by our author, the "Discourses," *Les Discours*; (4) his refusal to designate this source the "Logia" is due to his maintaining that Papias meant by the term "Logia" "the entire First Gospel which he incorrectly considered to have been composed originally in Hebrew;" (5) Mark, as well as Matthew and Luke, used these Discourses of Jesus; (6) Matthew and Luke are not interdependent.

The editorial work of Matthew is easily seen in his use of types, figures, prophecy, allegory, also in the apologetic treatment of facts, shown in the elimination of superfluous facts and the idealization and dramatization of other facts. Again, the hand of the editor is shown in the formal agreement of details among themselves, as also in the grouping of the material. Matthew, in the opinion of the author, is a theologian, an apologist, a harmonist, "a past master in the art of arranging facts in accordance with a thought scheme. He is a rabbi."

Luke, on the other hand, is a litterateur, an artist, having an eye for proportion and fitness. He has enlarged the gospel frame-work. Matthew traced the genealogy of Jesus as far back as Abraham; Luke carried it back to Adam, to God. Looking towards the future, he includes in his scheme "the times of the Gentiles" and their conversion. The litterateur appears again in the minor details, such as introductions and conclusions of narratives, also in the use of dialogue.

In the opinion of our author, Papias has not faithfully portrayed the task of Mark in constructing his Gospel. It is not a direct echo of Peter, nor of any immediate witness of the life of Jesus. On the other hand, it is not the free invention of an imaginative brain. In other words, the compiler had access to the "Discourses," as well as to oral tradition and to certain written documents which had already been reworked. Mark is not

a creator; he is not a historian; but the writer of a "Gospel"—his own word; a catechist, under the guise of a historian.

It is impossible, within the space of a brief review, to pass upon the accuracy of the author's conclusions on the many questions involved in such a study. Indeed, the value of the treatise does not consist in the correctness of the specific conclusions, but rather in the suggestiveness of the method and the grouping of the material. The book will have to be reckoned with by all who discuss the synoptic problem. It is a valuable contribution to the subject.

HENRY BEACH CARRÉ

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

This second half of Vol. III of Spitta's *Urchristliche Litteratur*<sup>3</sup> appears after an interval of six years. Those who recall the keenness and minute scholarship of his earlier contributions will welcome its appearance.

On the Temptation story Spitta's acute analysis presents the Lucan form as least altered from the original tradition underlying all three synoptic accounts. In the representation of an actual journey from the wilderness of Judaea to Jerusalem such as Luke contemplates Spitta finds room (with allowance made for editorial modification by the third evangelist under the influence of Mark and Matthew) for a real experience of Jesus in some measure corresponding to the three solicitations of Satan, which therefore are not merely symbolic as modern critics usually conclude, but foreshadow the later opposition to Jesus' loftier messianic ideal just because of his realization of actual conditions. As Spitta rightly says (p. 92): "the historicity of the Temptation story stands or falls with that of the Baptism." If such a consciousness of his messianic calling as is there implied came to Jesus before the beginning of his ministry, such a psychological reaction as the Temptation represents is to be expected. Spitta thinks it possible to find traces of it even in John, chaps. 1-3.

In Mark Spitta endeavors to show besides the admitted lacuna at the end, that the beginning also represents mere editorial reconstruction of a lost page, and that between chaps. 3 and 4 the substance of Luke 6:20-8:3, except 7:11-17, 36-50, has been lost by accident from the original MS.

Spitta disagrees with the judgment of M. R. James, whose edition of the *Testament of Job* appeared in 1897, with the statement by the editor: "I began by looking upon it as purely Jewish and indeed pre-Christian in date.

<sup>3</sup> *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*. Von Friedrich Spitta. Dritter Band, zweite Hälfte. "Die Versuchung Jesu. Lücken im Markusevangelium. Das Testament Hiobs und das Neue Testament." Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1907. 210 pages. M. 6.

I do not hold that view now." In company with a strong group of experts Spitta gives the great weight of his authority to James's earlier view. It is not even worked over by a Christian hand. The many and close correspondences with New Testament ideas and phraseology are not due to dependence on the part of the *Testament of Job*. On the contrary dependence upon the *Testament* is evinced in James, Revelation, and perhaps in Luke, Acts, and John. More especially the figure of Job, the hero of the tale, developed as representative of Israel, and of Israel as the suffering Servant of Yahweh, a protagonist of the poor and lowly against Satan, reduced to "the dust of death" as an innocent and uncomplaining sufferer, but exalted again by God to glory and honor, is of the utmost value when its independence of New Testament influence has been demonstrated, to exhibit the atmosphere in which the gospel story was molded.

We owe a debt of gratitude to such minute and discriminating study as Spitta's, however reluctant we may be to follow his inferences in detail.

B. W. BACON

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL  
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

#### THE DESTINATION OF GALATIANS<sup>1</sup>

Two years ago Dr. Steinmann published a study of *Die Abfassungszeit des Galaterbriefes* which was at once recognized as heralding a powerful restatement of what is known as the North-Galatian theory. The present monograph forms a sequel to his earlier work. It is written with the same exhaustive knowledge of the relevant literature,<sup>2</sup> the same independent judgment, and the same evidence of original, indefatigable research. Hitherto those of us who were profoundly dissatisfied with the South-Galatian theory, on exegetical and historical grounds, have had to fall back upon Schmiedel's article in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* for a detailed refutation. But Schmiedel had his limitations. His view of Acts rather discounted certain of his proofs, or they handicapped others. Now we have Dr. Steinmann coming forward from a conservative position in the criticism of Acts and Galatians alike with what seems to the present writer a convincing and comprehensive presentation of the older view that Galatians was written after the Council of Jerusalem to the Christian churches of

<sup>1</sup>*Der Leserkreis des Galaterbriefes*. Ein Beitrag zur urchristlichen Missionsgeschichte. Von Dr. Alphons Steinmann. Münster: Aschendorff, 1908. xx + 251 pages. M. 6.80.

<sup>2</sup>To the adherents of the North-Galatian view we might add Professor G. H. Gilbert (*The Student's Life of Paul*, 1902, pp. 260 f.) and Bousset (in J. Weiss's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, on Galatians).